

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8, 9 and 11 were pending with Claims 1 and 6 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 11 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsueda (U.S. App. No. 2002/0186400) in view of Okada (U.S. Pat. 6,396,952).

In regard to Independent Claim 1, the Office Action has not provided a prior art reference or references that teach or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claim.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a printing apparatus that processes a print job and includes: "a determining unit configured to determine whether the print job specified in the request still exists in the printing apparatus, in a case where the request is received by the request receiving unit; a responding unit configured to transmit response information indicating that the request has been received to the information processing system before cancellation of the print job

specified in the request is completed in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request still exists in the printing apparatus, and to transmit error information to the information processing system in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request does not exist in the printing apparatus, as a response to the request received by the request receiving unit” (emphasis added).

Thus, in the present invention, when a request for canceling a print job is received from the information processing system, if a print job specified by the request still exists in the printing apparatus, the printing apparatus transmits to the information processing system, information indicating that the request has been received before cancellation of the print job is completed as a response to the request for canceling the print job. Accordingly, a user of the information processing apparatus can be notified that the request has been received, after the request for canceling the print job is issued and before cancellation of the print job specified by the request is completed.

Reviewing Matsueda, it discloses that in a case where the server printing system 12-2 receives a job cancellation request from the client printing system 12-1, the server printing system 12-2 determines whether a status of a job to be canceled by the received job cancellation request is “being entered” or “already entered” (Paragraph 81). Furthermore, Matsueda discloses that in a case where the status of the job is “already entered”, the server printing system 12-2 issues a job cancel command to the printer 231 (Paragraph 81). On the other hand, when the job status is “being entered” (the job does not exist in printer 231), the server

printing system 12-2 changes a job status managed in the job management table 1202, to "to be canceled" (Paragraph 81).

Additionally, the server printing system, which performs the determination as discussed above, does not transmit information indicating that the job cancellation request has been received, to the client printing system 12-1 which has issued the job cancellation request, before cancellation of the job specified by the job cancellation request is completed. The Office Action states that Matsueda describes the feature of the responding unit of claim 1 in paragraph [0081]. However, Matsueda merely describes that the server printing system 12-2 issues a cancel command to the printer 231 in step S85, and receives a cancel command response from the printer 231 (emphasis added) (Paragraph 81). Nothing describes that the server printing system 12-2 transmits a cancel command response to the client printing system 12-1. Thus, Matsueda does not teach or suggest where a request for canceling a print job is received from an information processing system, an apparatus, which determines whether the print job specified by the request exists in a printer or not, transmits response information indicating that the request has been received to the information processing system, as recited in Claim 1.

Reviewing Okada, it describes a printing machine that identifies a notification e-mail address and notifiable result information which is included in received print data. Furthermore, in a case where a process result of the print data matches with the notifiable result information, the printing machine transmits a notification message corresponding to the process result to the notification e-

mail address. Nothing in Okada teaches or describes in a case where the printing apparatus receives a request for canceling a print data from the information processing system, the printing apparatus transmits response information indicating that the request has been received, to the information processing system, as recited in Claim 1.

Because Matsueda and Okada lack at least the above-noted features of Claim 1, Matsueda or Okada, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claims 6 and 11 are directed to a method and apparatus of canceling a print job and were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 6 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 6 and 11 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims (Claims 2-5 and 8-9) are dependent claims and depend from one of allowable Claims 1 or 6. Therefore, the dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3104.

Respectfully submitted,

07/20/2010

/Jonathan Ibasco/

Date

Jonathan Ibasco, Reg. No. 63,628
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560